

# UNITY

AND THE UNIVERSITY.

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

VOLUME XVII.]

CHICAGO, AUGUST 28, 1886.

[NUMBER 26.]

## CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER.

### EDITORIALS—

NOTES: Religion and Ethics; Principles and Test-words; A Trial of the Embryo Song-book; The Effect of a Cer- tain Party on Manners; Unity Clubs in the East; A Colo- rado Pilgrimage; The Manifesto of the Chautauqua Brethren.....	355
Christening a Country Church. W. C. G.....	356
Our Twin Unitarian Superstitions, and How to Get Rid of Them. W. C. G.....	357

### CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES—

Thelism. EDWARD B. PAYNE.....	360
Two Illustrations from Life.....	360

### CORRESPONDENCE—

Some Ingenious Definitions of "Parties".....	361
--	-----

NOTES FROM THE FIELD.....	362
---------------------------	-----

ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	363
--------------------	-----

IN the August *Unitarian* and recent numbers of the *Christian Register*, Dr. James Freeman Clarke throws the weight of his honored name against those who, at Cincinnati, "resolved that the Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all who wish to join it to help establish truth and righteousness and love in the world." At three or four points he misconceives what some of us are thinking. For instance, about the word "religion" and "religious". We do not divide "ethics" from "religion" as he does, and consequently cannot accept his talk about "ethics only", and "mere ethics" and "substituting an ethical for a religious purpose" as correctly describing anything said or done at Cincinnati. To us, what is commonly called "religion" is ethics with its heavenly horizons recognized, nor is ethics really ethics to us till these horizons—this infinite, eternal element—are recognized. But to such religion as this—and we believe it is the very heart and substance of all "religions"—the name of neither "God" nor "Christianity" is necessary. These two words we value, but value as words intending dogma (doctrine) more or less specific; while "religion" words man's sense of universal relations, however the universe or man's relations to it be conceived. That hints a meaning too large and various to be called a dogma. Now, no one proposed at Cincinnati to give a "religious" basis to the Conference fellowship as distinct from the two dogmatic words. Such a proposal was voted down four years ago, when earnestly pressed by some of us. Perhaps for that reason no one thought of it at Cincinnati, but more probably the "religion" was taken for granted there. Our Western Conference seal, like every copy of *UNITY*, carries the motto, "Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion". Several of our State Conferences indicate their fellowship in precisely this way. The word, we think, would have been welcome at Cincinnati. And yet, if Doctor Clarke, or anyone, stands ready to contend that "religion" has dogmatic meaning too, as distinct from the essential

ethics, then we are glad that by a happy accident words no one can doubt as "mere"—and purest—"ethics" were the words that fell into the Cincinnati resolution. To ourselves they thereby are the distilled essence of "religion." G.

AGAIN, Doctor Clarke says we have defended our position as that of historical Unitarianism by quoting the many declarations of our Unitarian leaders that the only essential thing is goodness, while forgetting that they maintained with equal decision their faith in Christ and Christianity and God. So they did, and so we said; and, instead of claiming to hold the historic Unitarianism of the fathers, we have expressly and repeatedly and with detail arraigned the elder, and much of our current, Unitarianism for not only combining these two things—which is all right—but for combining them in a *test of Unitarian fellowship*. That, we said, was self-contradicting: that denied a "creed" while making one. (See *UNITY* of January 23, February 13, March 20, May 29, etc.) The "principles", and the "doctrinal beliefs", of Unitarianism, we called these two things; and by the first we meant those emphases on Freedom, Fellowship and Character in religion which are worded in our motto. What we have claimed, and continue to claim, is that in the history of the Unitarian movement (1820, 1845, 1870, 1882, each date standing for a crisis) these principles are seen steadily eating up the doctrines, not as doctrines, but as *necessary* doctrines, as *tests* of Unitarian fellowship; and that therefore we, in to-day refusing to make any, even the greatest doctrines ("Christianity", "immortality" "God"), such *tests*, are directly in the line of the whole movement. The whole history of Unitarianism is for us. Our position is a departure and on-going from the Unitarianism of the fathers straight along the path the fathers trod. In that sense only is it "historic Unitarianism", if one likes the phrase. We care for the sense, because—Unitarianism being confessedly a "movement", not a down-sitting—it makes it honest for us to claim the Unitarian name as long as it remains the name desirable. It is the sense in which, we take it, Jesus spoke the words which Doctor Clarke quotes for our admonishment from Matt. v. 17. But we care much for the distinct departure and on-going, too,—just as we take it Jesus cared for his "But I say unto you", which separated him from "them of old time" and thereby made him Jesus. Deeply and gladly we do think that this suspected Unitarianism called "Western", is a Unitarianism of a somewhat new type, and that it will yet be cordially recognized as such by the general body,—which will gradually become "Western" too! G.

THE value of the work undertaken by some of our associates in matching rational verses to the best of the "Gospel Tunes" was tested at the recent Grove meeting at Helena. A sufficient number of the leaflet recently printed in this paper was distributed among a large audience of country and orthodox people, and the four meetings and the attendant intermissions were made lively and spirited by the hearty singing of helpful words to the moving tunes of "Coronation," "Hold the Fort," "The Old, Old Story," etc. We hope those having it in charge will make all possible haste in giving us this five-cent hymn-book, and that



it will be introduced as a supplement to existing collections in all our churches. If we ever expect to have a body of religious folk-song to emphasize the Liberal Faith, we must have songs the folks can sing, and concerning these the folks themselves must be consulted.

A RECENT number of *The Christian Life*, published in London, contains a handling of pending problems of Western Unitarianism under the caption of "From Christianity to Humbug". Too much piety of a certain kind makes people very rude.

AN important movement was set afoot at the Weirs Landing this summer, looking toward the establishing of reading classes in all our churches, and a committee was appointed of which George W. Cooke, of West Dedham, Mass., is temporary Chairman and Secretary. We trust our Eastern churches will take hold of this matter and improve on what has already become almost an universal branch of the Western Unitarian Churches.

THE readers of UNITY will be interested in the following extract from a private letter just received from Manitou, Col., dated August 13.

"Yesterday thirty of us had a picnic at Cheyenne cañon, and while there did not fail to visit Helen Hunt's grave on the mountain top. The spot she selected was the one, if she still gazes out, that gives her the most wonderful and expansive view of the vast valley beyond Colorado Springs. We found the grave covered with rocks and bits of green, and even visiting cards; and remembering her last request that her grave be kept ever green with pine needles, we went to work and covered the place with pine branches fresh and fragrant, completely concealing all the other tributes which previous pilgrims had left."

IN another column we print a declaration from certain brethren who were present at the recent Lakewood School of New Theology at Chautauqua concerning the so-called "Issue in the West". The character of the manifesto is such as would be expected from the brethren signing it. The "entire unanimity" is not surprising, since the gathering, judged at least by the speakers, seems not so much a "School of New Theology" as a New School of not so very New Theology. That cannot be settled by debate which can only be tested by time, and so we have no disposition to argue with these brethren. We deplore their facility in drawing lines and making parties. We could not so promptly arrogate to ourselves the great words "Christian" and "Theistic" which we as promptly denied to our fellows. We regret the effective antitheses which set "Christianity" and "Theism" over against Ethics and Unity, but commend the candor and clearness which so frankly indicate the purpose of these brethren and of the minority at Cincinnati to use these words as measuring-rods to mark the bounds of Unitarian Fellowship,—to use them thus rather than to leave them to be the burden and inspiration of a movement the very soul of which is the inclusive spirit that welcomes every truth-seeker, grants honor to every right-doer, makes of Christianity a moral attainment rather than an intellectual definition, and identifies God with the excellences and the moral forces of the universe without which God is but a name, with which He is all in all, even though unnamed. If these brethren would make their contrast just they should add to each of their first four questions "as conditions of Unitarian fellowship". The real "Issue" between the majority and the minority at Cincinnati, as is more clearly brought out in this manifesto, is that the minority sought a line of cleavage, courted schism, tried to put asunder those whom the majority believed God has joined together. The majority felt that the trend of the

Western Conference towards an undogmatic fellowship, towards a religious unity based in love, towards church co-operation founded on the purpose of helpfulness and spiritual communion, springing out of a common love and search for truth, was a holy trend, a movement Godward, a leading of the Holy Spirit which they would not distrust or retard. The minority called a halt, asked for labels, and revived the spirit of doctrinal disputes, theological discussion and dogmatic distinctions, which has always been the reproach of ecclesiastical organizations and the chief hindrance to that Christianity which Channing described as comprehended in the one purpose, "the perfection of human nature and the elevation of men into nobler beings".

We call attention to the great affirmations and holy agreements which our Chautauqua brethren confess. These we have taken the liberty of numbering as 10, 11, 12, 13, and hasten to assure them that, while they hold to these, they are of us and with us. We cannot do without them, however much they may seek to cast us off. The world waits for the church that has sufficient faith in God and the Christ-like life to plant itself on these "essentials", and on these alone. Such is the church which the prophetic souls in all ages have foreseen and foreshadowed. Such a church we believe the Unitarian movement has tended toward, and now, as never before, has the opportunity of being. If it proves faithless to its opportunity we shall deplore its degeneracy, but lose not one whit of faith in or zeal for this church that is ever coming into the world. We hope that in connection with this declaration of the eight brethren of the "New School," our readers will re-read the letter to the churches recently issued by the Board of Directors of the W. U. C., and published in UNITY of July 31, from which we quote:

"Western Unitarianism, so far as represented by the majority at the Cincinnati Conference, does not refuse to fellowship any person of approved character and good works who is drawn to us in spirit but may not share in all our deep beliefs. The resolution means that we neither wish, nor feel we have a right, to give our Unitarianism bounds that will exclude those who worship God in spirit and in truth and in their life, whether they worship him in name or not. The resolution means that if such a man, be he layman or minister, eager to establish truth and righteousness and love in the world, comes to our gates, sees us worship, hears us at prayer, listens to our spoken faiths, and says, 'Let me join you; my purpose is your purpose, though my faith is not wholly your faith', he shall be welcome, welcome unreservedly. The resolution means that we would rather take the consequences in the world's eyes of accepting, than the consequences in our own souls, and in that man's, of rejecting him."

#### CHRISTENING A COUNTRY CHURCH.

This year we went again to Helena Valley, where so much of the Jones nation as belongs to the editor has its farms, and, every summer, a family re-union. A year ago the father still sat among his children and grand-children, and wrote his name upon the subscription paper for the chapel which children and neighbors hoped to build in the valley. But this year there was no father,—the old man had died in early winter. The little church, however, was there, and in a certain sense it seemed to be in his place,—the valley's heart, and all gathering about it, and holy in itself. A cottage-church, a gem of a church, the daintiest, cosiest nest of a church that ever lay on a meadow among the Wisconsin hills. If anyone seeing it should prefer to call it a glorified school-house, with proper accent on the "glorified", we should not be unhappy,—liking that kind of a church. Its picture was printed in UNITY some months ago, but without the colors on,—the dark red of the roof and the brown mottle of the shingled sides, pedestaled on light stone courses. Inside, the trinity of rooms which the modern church demands,—an audience room, a parlor (these two parted only by a heavy curtain), and a mite of a kitchen. In the first room eighty people can listen in red-backed chairs, and four grandmothers in four old-fashioned rockers, thoughtfully provided. The parlor adds space for



seventy seats more. Both are wood-ceiled, with the pine in its own color; one is calcimined in terra cotta, one in olive-green;—a boy architect belonging to the family looked after this interior. The book-case holds the acorn of a valley library, and the kitchen cupboard won't quite shut for the dishes,—tumblers at 2½ cents each! Furnished, it all cost some \$1,600 in cash and perhaps \$300 more in given labor. If you want one like it for *your* valley, write to the architect, J. L. Silsbee, Lakeside building, Chicago. In the valley homesteads this \$1,900 covers some willing pinch and sacrifice, so no wonder that \$225 of it must be for a while a "debt".

We went up to dedicate this little church and hold Grove Meeting. But first a shadow was to fall,—or shall we say, a light? For one of the young men finished dying. Seldom has a braver man than Orren Evans died. Last summer saw him bringing his young bride to the family gathering,—no one there with brighter prospects opening. Mid-winter saw him in Chicago to ask the doctors the meaning of a strange swelling on his neck. The doctors looked him in the eye and answered him: it was the grip of cancer at his throat. "What will you do, Orren, when you get home?" his uncle asked him as they rode back in the horse-cars. "I think I'll go right on as if nothing were the matter, as long as I can stand it." So he did. The thing soon had dragged him from his work, and the secret was out. Each week came pain a little worse, and cheer equal to it. One groan is remembered,—a midnight groan, when he thought no one heard; but often the veins on his brow would stand out and the sweat roll down with the still agony. A few weeks from the end one asked, "How does it look now, Orren?" "A good deal better than you all think." "It's hard to leave so soon after starting the home." "Yes, but I have had a good time. I guess I've had about my share, if I have to stop now." "Do you expect to see Charley?" "I don't know. Perhaps so. I think very likely. But if not, it's all right anyway." "What can I do for you, Orren?" "Nothing, Uncle Jenk; there's nothing you can do for me until its all over with. Then I want you to stand by the coffin and speak a word for the faith that carried me through." So the brave man spent six months in dying,—not knowing that in six months of dying *so* he was living out years' worth of high example and building his own memorial. The week was happier for hearing he had gone. We drove over the hills and at the place he named we heard the "word spoken for the faith that carried him through".

Among simple, workful lives, lived close to the realities and necessities, death is not the strange, all-changing thing it is apt to be in the leisures of the well-to-do. It joins on to life as naturally as shadows join the landscape, making it more beautiful. So the day following the funeral the Grove Meeting began as advertised, and eyes could fill with either smiles or tears according to the word. The next day, Sunday, the little church overflowed with neighbors and well-wishers interested in the dedication-service. Many of them had taken generous part in the building of it. The Madonna-and-Child element was present in force, though not in noise, and made the Love of God seem visible and human. The very dog or two, whom no one dreamed of banishing, seemed to enlarge the meeting indefinitely; and just outside were "all hills, fruitful trees, beasts and all cattle, creeping things, and flying fowl"; while we folks answered for "the kings of the earth and all people!" Pretty near the whole hundred and forty-eighth Psalm was present. It was a rich, tender service. Henry Simmons preached the dedication sermon. J. Ll. Jones, first in Welsh for the sake of auld lang syne and those who dwelt in it, and then in English, spoke special consecrating words. In his Meadville school-days, eighteen years before, he had organized a church, his first one, in the school-house near by, where also he preached his first sermon; and here at last was the church-home built,— "Unity Chapel of Helena Valley"; which the people now all joined in dedicating to the Truth which maketh free,

to the Righteousness which maketh clean the heart, to the fellowship of hearts and the bearing of each others' burdens,—to the memory of dear ones, of many prophet-souls, and him who died upon the cross for love of God and man,—to the sanctity of home ties, to the honoring of our country, to an ever-growing Christianity, and to thanksgiving to the Father and his worship. Then the little children of the valley homes, already in the midst, were brought forward to receive their names, each with a consecrating word,—an awe-struck group, half-baptized in their own tears! And at the evening service the young men and women joined themselves to the church-fellowship which their fathers and mothers had begun in the years gone.

So another church is built for the faith which makes faithful and carries men and women through and upwards. May it be all the builders hope! It is to be emphatically a people's church,—no minister is thought of: the children and young men and maidens and the elders will minister to each other in Sunday and week-day meetings, as in the past. May the debt soon be paid,—may the book-case in the corner soon grow to a wee "public library",—and within a summer or two may the little belfry be swinging bell-tones far and wide among the hills as Sunday morning comes!

—But it was not much of a vacation for our editor!

W. C. G.

## OUR TWIN UNITARIAN SUPERSTITIONS,

AND HOW TO GET RID OF THEM.

Elsewhere we notice two points in which Doctor Clarke criticises the position taken by the Western Conference at Cincinnati. We pass by other points and come to Doctor Clarke's main objection to what was done there. He thinks we fail to see the difference between a "creed" and a "platform". A creed tells what is to be believed, a platform tells what is to be done, he says. And a church or conference of churches may get along without a creed, but not without a platform, because "truth requires that any association which asks men to join shall say distinctly what its purpose is,—while love requires that, having said this, it shall open its doors widely to those who wish to come in". And he uses strong words to show his sense of the dishonesty involved in such a position as that taken at Cincinnati,— "ignoring or concealing difference", "unfair", "otherwise [without a platform] we deceive those whom we ask to join us, and seek to smuggle them into a church under the pretense that it is only a society for 'Freedom, Fellowship and Character'". *Deceive, smuggle and pretense* are about the strongest words yet used in this discussion. But in another article he calls us "open, honest and straightforward" in our action; and, if he hadn't, we should know he knew we were!

Now we write this article chiefly to advocate again something like Doctor Clarke's own thought, but we think Doctor Clarke greatly exaggerates the importance of a "platform", and even succeeds in misstating the real reason for one. About the last "need" in the world for a body of workers hard *at it* is to set forth in formal words what they are doing. Their deed declares itself. Even when the society or the church is just beginning and announcements, if ever, are in order, let it simply begin, and the work speaks louder than the constitution, and men forget it has a constitution. Hence,—because what a church is always, and visibly doing is much the most important part of its total proclamation, and because any platform built of words is but a whisper compared to this, Doctor Clarke's words *deceive, smuggle, pretense*, seem not wise words or true. We Unitarians belong to a church that for seventy years has been heard in the land preaching, praying, talking of God and the soul, and that is doing this to-day at least as loudly and rejoicingly as ever before in its history; and the western workers of this church, whatever impression some of our comrades have tried to spread in the east of them, are



known in the west as worshipers; and further, we suspect it is a simple fact that, of all the workers east or west, no group of men, so small in numbers and so weak, has so industriously worked these last few years to spread abroad in publication-ways the common faiths of Unitarianism as just the little group that has been singled out as leading the churches astray. "No man shall stop us of this boasting in the regions of Achaia"—for just once! In the west we do not need to tell men that they will enter "churches" when they come to us; they know it of us before entering, they will find us at worship when they enter, they will leave us at it when they leave dissatisfied, if leave they do. But for all that, worship is not our main business as Unitarians, nor is it that part of our business which shall confer our name. We have printed over our Conference doors a welcome to all who wish to join us to help establish truth and righteousness and love in the world. That is our main business, we think, as Unitarians. That shall confer our name, so far as we have right to indicate conditions. We mean the welcome without flinch or equivocation. We shall not stop our worship for the new-comer, but we will not compel him to join in it, and still we will halve our name with him. We like not Doctor Clarke's implication that to establish truth and righteousness and love in the world is not a sufficiently noble or definite purpose and work for a Unitarian church to announce as the work it has to do. To actually help do this is to live the life of God and to do his work, whether we call our motive "love of man" or "love of God"; and the living of his life and the doing of his work, and not the naming of his name, will some time be sufficient test for name-sharing among all Unitarians, we hope,—nay, we believe it. At Cincinnati some of us in the Western Conference simply said that for us it was sufficient test today. If we understand Martineau rightly in understanding him literally, we share the conviction which he, our still surviving Channing, uttered, "looking back over the remembered work of four score years",—"a conviction that the true religious life supplies grounds of sympathy and association deeper and wiser than can be expressed by any doctrinal names and formulas; and that free play can never be given to these genuine spiritual affinities till all stipulation, *direct or implied*, for specified agreement in theological opinion is discarded from the bases of church union".

No, it is not Doctor Clarke's motive of *honesty*, nor specially to inform men what we are going to do,—for these ends are abundantly provided for in other ways,—that makes us advocate with him a sort of platform. Our motive is a *missionary* one, and looks frankly towards *beliefs*, not deeds. Our reason for a platform is not lest men should be beguiled into our midst under false pretenses, but that more men everywhere may get some clearer idea of the length and breadth and depth and height of the Unitarian faith,—while learning, as the first thing of all about that faith, that it does not call doctrinal belief, however dear, *essential* to the name and fellowship. Not that we deem this "platform" method as important as some think it, or believe that it will greatly help to organize new churches. Such proclamations are but word-smoke, after all, and churches spread by heart-fire, not by word-smoke. Still it may help somewhat, and we think it one of our two Unitarian superstitions that makes so many of us so afraid of it.

But just here is where, in turn, *our honesty* grows alert. It is confessedly a hard thing to make—an honest church platform of beliefs. It is confessedly a dangerous thing—the danger being that the platform is so apt to harden into a "creed", the statement of doctrines dwarf into a doctrinal test of fellowship. Nearly all churches save ours have a platform, and in nearly all of these it is meant to be a "creed", and where not meant to be it often virtually is one. Now, if we Unitarians think seriously of platform-building, we must be very careful. Few of us think that we desire a "creed", a doctrinal test of fellowship; but if we do not desire it, then our platform must be so

constructed that it shall not *be* such a test. It must somehow be indicative, without being imperative, of our beliefs,—a "Credo" without in any way implying "Crede", at the outset, and with precaution against its ever becoming a "Crede" in its outcome. We cannot proclaim beliefs as "essential" to Unitarianism, and break up churches and conferences and try to form new ones just to establish their essentialness, and at the same time say we want no "creed",—cannot, simply because Yes does not mean No. We cannot honorably imbed a doctrinal implication—for instance, the "love of God or Christ", insisted on as something distinct from love of man—in what professes to be an invitation to fellowship independent of all theology. There are men among us who *can* do this and be honest, but, spite of their disclaimers, such an implication *does* go far towards turning the platform into the "creed" at the outset. Doctor Martineau was right in saying, just above, "till all stipulation *direct or implied*, is discarded". Not only have outsiders a right to suspect that the doctrine so carefully inserted, the word so strenuously insisted on, in the invitation, in some way limits the fullness of the invitation, but such limitation is actually meant by many of the inviters. At Cincinnati we were confronted by a man who in reports, in pamphlet and in addresses, has kept on virtually saying,—we might put almost every sentence in quotation marks:—*I don't want any creed, not I: I only want Unitarians to lay down one or two "necessary beliefs". I wouldn't cut off or bar out anybody—far from it: I only want it understood that non-Christians and non-theists, though hospitably entertained by us, have not full Unitarian rights here. For too many sorts of people are coming in among us! "Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion" is not the main track in religion,—it is only a "switch" that leads "to Niagara Falls and over". We must not draw up articles of faith, for that would interfere with the rights of congregations and individuals: but of course we must have a "doctrinal basis" and call a few doctrines "essential",—for how else can we be Unitarians, or how could people know we go to "church"? Not a creed though—how can anybody imagine that I want that? Not a creed; we'll call it "what we stand for", or "our banner", or our "platform", or "our purpose as a Conference". If there is a layman who don't believe these necessary doctrines,—well, he will do for a church-trustee or Sunday-school superintendent: no great harm in that. But if there is a *minister* who does not hold them,—doesn't he see the door? doesn't he know where he ought to go?—We have listened to a great deal of this. And in it all, the man's sincerity is unquestioned. The intellectual paradox of the position dazes us. If the trouble be in our own mind—and it may be, for the position seems to be held by other able men besides the one referred to—we share it with so many that no kinder word just now could be written than one which would analyze this seeming paradox and prove it none.*

In no such way as this, in no such spirit of fear and self-protection, with no such nervous wish to get rid of non-believers and tell the world that we are Christians after all, is our Unitarian "platform" to be constructed. If we *mean* to refuse co-equal right to our name on account of non-belief in certain doctrines great and dear, let us do so,—but do so *openly*, not by implication. Let us frankly say, "We have been mistaken all along; our fathers, too, have been mistaken; unknowingly, they always had a 'creed'; now consciousness has come, and, knowingly, we want one." Consciousness *has* come as never before in this matter, and now we must either go on or go back; back to an acknowledged "creed", or on to a frank and unreserved abandonment of all doctrinal beliefs and test-words as conditions of our Unitarian fellowship. By 1900 the great majority of Unitarians will have decided between the two alternatives, and we have little doubt which way.

And yet we believe, and all the more because it is so near to 1900 and to that decision, that a "platform", in the sense of a public and joint declaration of Unitarian be-



lief, is possible; may be helpful; can be honest; and that the credal danger in it may be avoided. This "Issue" difficulty,—this inability of earnest minds that accept essentially the same great principles and doctrines of religion,—to approve each other's course as wholly honest, would seem to show that both parties must be aiming at a genuine right, and that there must be a reconciling method to combine those rights. We must find it. A wedge has been deliberately sent to all our churches, and in some of them there are a few persons who will industriously try to apply it. Do such people realize that several churches and perhaps conferences may be virtually broken up by them or much maimed, the next two years? And why broken? *Because A, who believes with B, cannot join him in saying to C, "You must believe these things too, to earn full title to our Unitarian name! That is the reason why! Seldom has there been a more gratuitous, minuter cause for breaking churches. The shame of such a break would haunt our history for years. It would be worse in shame than the Parker "issue", worse even than the inglorious Hepworth time.*

Both parties in this issue have a genuine right in view. One is standing strenuously against a "creed." It is surely right in that. The other, claiming to be against "creed" too, is standing for more positive affirmation of great truths commonly believed by us. Very well,—why should not Unitarians at last combine and make that public affirmation, but in such a way that it shall be impossible for themselves or any one around to treat it as a "creed"? Nearly all we read from men on the other side of this discussion confirms our thought that not only reconciliation now, but real advance for the cause of pure religion lies in—never for one instant abandoning or weakening the Cincinnati resolution just as it was passed,—but in adding to it the other resolutions coupled with it then, but then rejected. These other resolutions suggested that a statement of the things most commonly believed today among us be drawn up, guarded by an ample explanatory preamble. (See below.) Under our Cincinnati circumstances the idea was very naturally rejected; and all our traditional feeling was of course against it. And not until a large majority of a Conference agrees together in a generous spirit to try to make such a declaration, should the attempt be made. We Unitarians have always cherished twin superstitions. One is the fear of making a purely ethical basis of fellowship, because such a basis might seem to say we had no doctrinal beliefs. Its twin is the fear of making a joint declaration of doctrinal beliefs, because such a declaration might seem, and might prove to be, a "creed". So it would be a "creed", and it is to be feared until the ethical basis of fellowship is fully and sincerely meant, and openly avowed; then the creed-danger would be forever gone; for then the "declaration" would be always advertising itself as a temporary statement of actual beliefs held by a majority, but binding none. On the other hand, make such "declarations" and the fear of the ethical basis of fellowship would be forever gone; for then that basis would be always advertising itself as accompanied with great beliefs. *We Unitarians have two superstitions. The way to get rid of each superstition is to get rid of the other at the same time. Couple the ethical basis of fellowship with the doctrinal statement, and each becomes safe.*

Nor safe alone: that deed would mean advance for Unitarianism. Nor advance for us alone,—it would set a new ideal of religion before all the churches around ours. Make Truth and Righteousness and Love today the sole basis of our little fellowship—MEAN that and stand by it, taking all consequences—it will be an inspiration to word and sing and print our faiths as we have never yet done, and our grand-children will find that we have been laying the corner-stone of the great Church Catholic! Men will call us Atheist at first, just as they called our fathers sixty years ago un-Christian; some of little faith will fall away from us; we shall lose money-bags at first;—and, just as sixty years ago, we shall begin to leaven Christendom anew.

To illustrate what we mean, we are going to reprint the Cincinnati resolutions referred to, and append to them a statement of Unitarianism taken from UNITY's columns of last January and called then "Unitarianism in a Nut-Shell".\* Not that it is fitted to be the proposed declaration of the Conference,—it is manifestly unfitted. But suppose that the committee of five should report in this, or any other way, such report, with those first two resolutions kept ever to the front as preambles, could be adopted by a Conference without any credal danger that we see, and without infringing in the least on congregational or on individual rights. With the statement always guarded and ennobled by those preambles, one would not need or expect to have it worded exactly to his personal preference, or care to have it re-worded every year or two. For five or ten years, or till it were re-worded to better serve the general need, it would be a "platform", a banner-statement of our faith. We do not see why this method does not secure the end our disappointed brothers at the Cincinnati Conference had at heart,—provided that end with them was really not a "creed" and not exclusion. And this method would be more true and generous than that adopted by the National Conference to approach the same result, inasmuch as it would reverse the order and frankly put into the preamble, where it belongs, the great act of spiritual fellowship, and into the subordinate place the act of doctrinal belief. The day perhaps has not yet come, but we think the day will come when we shall all be noble enough and full of faith enough to trust each other and ourselves to do this thing. Perhaps the real date of the Cincinnati resolutions, and of a National Conference to match it, is not 1886, but 1900.

#### The Cincinnati Resolutions:—

"RESOLVED, THAT THE WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE CONDITIONS ITS FELLOWSHIP ON NO DOGMATIC TESTS, BUT WELCOMES ALL WHO WISH TO JOIN IT TO HELP ESTABLISH TRUTH AND RIGHT-EOUSNESS AND LOVE IN THE WORLD.

"RESOLVED, THAT WHILE THE ABOVE EXPRESSLY REPRESENTS THE BASIS AND WIDTH OF OUR FELLOWSHIP, AND WHILE THE CONFERENCE HAS NEITHER THE WISH NOR THE RIGHT TO BIND ITSELF OR ANY SINGLE MEMBER BY A DECLARATION OF DOCTRINES, IT YET THINKS SOME PRACTICAL GOOD MAY BE DONE BY SETTING FORTH IN SIMPLE WORDS THE THINGS MOST COMMONLY BELIEVED TO-DAY AMONG US, THE STATEMENT BEING ALWAYS OPEN TO RESTATEMENT AND TO BE REGARDED ONLY AS THE THOUGHT OF THE MAJORITY.

"Resolved, That to this end a committee of five be appointed to draw up such a declaration of belief, to be submitted to the Conference at its next annual meeting."

As a possible report of said committee in reference to Unitarianism and its beliefs:—

In this country Unitarians came out from the Congregational churches of New England some eighty years ago,—came out as new Protestants, asserting (1) the Supremacy of Character above Beliefs in Religion; (2) the Rights of Reason in the use of the Bible Revelation; (3) the Dignity, as against the Depravity, of Human Nature; (4) the Unity, not Trinity, of God; the Divinity, not Deity, of Christ; and that Christ was sent as teacher to save us from our sins, not as substitute to save us from the penalties of sin.

Channing was their leader then. Since Channing's day belief in the Bible as a miraculous revelation, or in Christ as having any authority whatever save as his word coincides with natural reason and natural right, has largely faded away among them. This second movement of their thought began some forty years ago; and Emerson and Theodore Parker have been their real, though at first their unaccepted, leaders in it.

They have no "creed" in the usual sense; that is, no articles of belief which bind their churches and fix conditions of their fellowship. Character has always been to them the supreme matter. Above all "doctrines" they emphasize the "principles" of Freedom, Fellowship and Character in religion. These principles make their all sufficient test of fellowship.

They have religious beliefs, however, and for the most part hold these beliefs in common. With a few exceptions they may be called Christian theists; theists, as worshipping the One-in-All, and naming that One, "God, our Father"; Christian, because revering Jesus as the greatest of the historic prophets of religion; these names, as names, receiving more stress in their older than in their younger churches. And just because they have no "creed" which they impose as test of fellowship, statements of belief abound among them. One such statement we offer here:—

\* It is traced as Unity Short Tract, No. 10. Price, 30 cts. for 100.



We believe that to love the Good and live the Good is the substance of religion.

We believe that Reason and Conscience are final authorities in matters of religious belief.

And therefore,—

We believe in the nobility of human nature:

We revere Jesus and all holy souls, as prophets of religion:

We honor the Bible and all inspiring scripture, old or new:

We trust the Universe as beautiful, beneficent, unchanging Order; to know this Order is Truth; to obey it is Right and Liberty and stronger Life;

We believe that good and evil inevitably carry their own recompense, no good thing being failure and no evil thing success; that no evil can befall the good man in either life or death; that all things work together for the victory of Good:

We believe that we ought to join hands and work to make the good things better and the worst good, counting nothing good for self that is not good for all:

We believe that this self-forgetting life awakes in man the sense of union, here and now, with things eternal,—the sense of deathlessness; and this sense is to us an earnest of a life to come:

We worship One in All—that Life, whence suns and stars derive their orbits and the soul of man its Ought. This One we name the Eternal God, our Father.

We trust free thought; we trust it everywhere, and only fear thought bound. Therefore our beliefs are deepening and widening, as science, history and life reveal new truth; while our increasing emphasis is still on the right life and the great Faith of Ethics to which the right life leads,—faith in the Moral Order of the Universe, faith in All-Ruling Righteousness.

All names that divide "Religion" are to us of little consequence compared with it. Whoever loves Truth and lives the Good is, in a broad sense, of our religious fellowship; whoever loves the one or lives the other better than ourselves is our teacher, whatever church or age he may belong to. So our church is wide, our teachers many, and our holy writings large.

W. C. G.

## Contributed Articles.

### THEISM.

Once Truth and Righteousness and Love were tasked

To say if they believed in God, or no.

They stayed their steps before the soul that asked,

And each gave answer, with a conscious glow.

Said Truth, "He hears God's voice, who heareth me;

His word eternal, old and new, am I."

And Righteousness confessed herself to be,

"God's every act in earth and sea and sky."

Then Love stepped forth, with bearing all divine,

And said, "Behold God's heart is seen in me,

In me the splendors of his being shine,

All that God is and was and is to be."

Then all: "Arise and publish it abroad

That Truth and Righteousness and Love are God."

EDWARD B. PAYNE.

### TWO ILLUSTRATIONS FROM LIFE

OF WHAT WAS MEANT BY THE CINCINNATI RESOLUTION.

Not long ago a friend, troubled by UNITY's position in regard to the limits of Unitarian fellowship, wrote us, "I can understand how a man can be 'religious' without any belief in Christ, immortality, Bibles, or a hundred other 'dogmas'; but I am unable to conceive of any religion without a God, and therefore I cannot see why you should reject a *deistic* test of fellowship as 'dogmatic'." In reply to our answer came the following letter which we asked permission to print as an *illustration from life*, throwing light upon the Cincinnati resolution. It may help some one else to understand the meaning of the fellowship aspired to there, and its ground in the facts—instead of the names—of the religious life.

My dear Mr. —,—Two Providences! The first, your letter. It actually did what all the "Unity writing" failed somehow to do; it sent me back to a certain old book which I firmly believe no devout soul can entirely get away from. Your quotation of a certain saying of Jesus led me to look for others. Not that I must always have a written "Thus saith the Lord" for any truth, but I believe Jesus lived nearer to God and saw deeper into Truth than any other soul; and so I like to know what is recorded of his thought on any subject. And I am surprised at how much he said concerning "Truth, Love, Righteous-

ness", and how "names" and "symbols" were not at all pleasing to him. And I notice how he mixes Jew, Greek, Gentile, Christian, Pagan, in all his ideas of the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God. And when I came suddenly upon the Cup-of-Cold-Water "Test" by which even an atheist might gain admittance to the eternal blessedness, I said, "This is very old and *conservative*", but somehow it is very much like the "radicalism" I was fearing today.

Then came the second Providence to put in practical form the ideas born of your letter. Last Sunday I took a long walk along the beach north of the city, and in a solitary place I met a young man who, from my first sight of him, strongly attracted me. From commonplaces we drifted into personalities, then into books, then music, and after two hours of getting a little acquainted with each other's souls, we found ourselves quietly talking of the deeper things of life—or, rather, I found myself listening with joy to heart-thoughts born of some very deep and precious experiences in the other's life. I need not tell you what he said. I felt as though the place where we sat was holy, and I saw all about me the angels of Purity, Chivalry, Manhood, Truth, Righteousness, Duty—and as we arose to return to the city, I took his hand and said, "You must be taught of God!" He hesitated for a moment, then said slowly and even solemnly, "I have never been able to believe in a God! I see nothing but insensate Force about me everywhere! I worship nothing—love nothing, outside of humanity! I would like to believe in a Father-God: I have searched and do now search, but cannot find him."

I had been helped, inspired, lifted above much that is earthly, by an atheist! For a few moments I was confused, disappointed. Then I faced the Truth squarely and said to myself, This man is taught of God, whether he knows it or not; his heart is full of "truth, righteousness and love", and therefore is full of God. It matters not at all if he cannot use *names* and *symbols* which are customary to me: he possesses what the "names" and "symbols" stand for, and that is enough!

You see I believe in a Father-God, and so I believe He spoke to me in your letter and in my new-found friend. And I am happy—I know of no name, no symbol, no book, that will henceforth ever come between me and any soul of God's creation.

I thank you—and God.

Yours respectfully,

August 11, 1886.

Our second illustration comes to us from over the water, written by one of whom an acquaintance in the Meadville days writes: "I regretted much his not being able to finish his course at Meadville and enter the ministry, for I thought that he gave unusual promise of usefulness. I think that not even adverse circumstances would ever withdraw him entirely from the support of the liberal cause. so entirely *philadelphic* is his nature." We print this letter not only for the fellowship we bear all such souls far or near, but also as evidence of the clumsy classification of theologians and the doctrinaires, either inside or outside the Unitarian fold, who would ruthlessly classify men into Christian and non-Christian, theistic and non-theistic groups by their intellectual estimate of the universe, or, still more arbitrarily, by the words which they are able to use. If religion is a quality of soul, a temper of heart, a disposition of life, these illustrations reveal the religious life and our correspondents are Unitarians as we understand the word, because Unitarianism stands for *life not creed*, a search for excellency rather than the possession of a doctrine.

EDITORS OF UNITY:—Through the kindness of a friend I have just received some recent numbers of UNITY, and Mr. Sunderland's pamphlet "The Issue in the West." I have lived in America, studied at Meadville, and should be in a Unitarian pulpit to-day, if I could accept the Theistic and Christian position which Unitarianism has demanded. With regard to that position I have made no complaint, because it is clearly the right of every religious body to define where it stands. But I have always felt that Unitarianism has been making a great mistake. It has seemed to me to be seeking an unnatural alliance with



orthodox Christianity, and failing in its duty towards those who cannot accept Christianity at all. It has appeared to rejoice in minimizing the beliefs of believers, rather than in elevating the lives of unbelievers. It has not set itself to develop that strong and deep faith which underlies the skepticism of the age. It has been so ardently set on restoring the religion of the first century, that it has lost touch with the possibilities of religious development to-day.

Unless Unitarianism is prepared to make a move, it will soon be difficult for it to justify its separate existence. The orthodox churches are moving fast enough; there are numbers among them where Liberal Christians may find a home. But where are the churches in which those whom Mr. Sunderland calls extremists can find a home? He says that these extremists "for the most part care nothing for association with us." I fear he is right, if by "us" he means Unitarians of the type which he represents. But it makes me and my wife very unsettled here, when we know that in the Western States of America we might find hearts with whom we could work and worship, and never be asked whether we accepted the Christian faith. Oh, the joy and gladness we should feel to find ourselves among such! It is some relief to the feelings to write and tell you how glad we should be. You men who stand for fellowship in righteousness may be sailing under false colors, as Mr. Sunderland says; but we should wonderfully like to be in the same ship. We should be glad to help in hauling on a rope or setting a little more sail, without fear of being told that we did not belong to the crew.

Sometimes as I sit in the garden in the cool of the evening, and drink in all the beauty of the quiet time, and think of the little ones put safely to bed, and see the mother of them coming to me across the grass, I find it an easy matter to believe in God and a future life. Suddenly the cries of a child beaten by a passionate parent ring through the air, and make me shudder to the heart. The thermometer of faith falls, and I think how much remains to be done to make the earth what it should be. Am I a worse man, am I really less fit to stand in a pulpit even, because I am so sensitive of human wrong that the vision of God gets blurred?

I think that men of the deepest faith are often those who can say little about it, especially to such as demand faith as a credential. If I had to converse with Mr. Sunderland, I think I should feel myself almost an atheist. But I rejoice to know that, though I cannot reach them, there are men in the west who would not crush the little faith I can bring to the surface by demanding more. With men of principle a little faith goes a long way. I will not uncharitably say that the converse is true.

All good be with you men of the west who think that virtue is enough. If we could hope one day to join you in your work, life would be filled with greater brightness for us. We will try to fulfill our appointed task more bravely here, knowing that across the Atlantic are hearts beating with ours.

Yours very faithfully,

JOHN TREVOR.

SUDBURY, SUFFOLK, England, July 12, 1886.

## Correspondence.

EDITOR OF UNITY:—The Unitarian ministers who were at the Lakewood School of the New Theology, July 24-Aug. 8, held frequent and earnest conference on the western situation. All who attended, so far as known, deplored the action of the Western Conference at Cincinnati in refusing to declare or take any action toward declaring any basis of worship or doctrine admitting an object of worship. There was entire unanimity of sentiment among those present at the consultations as to the action that ought to be taken to place the matter fairly before the Unitarian body; and though several had left before any result was reached, the following contrasted statement

expresses our understanding of the position of the parties, and the significance and gravity of the questions at issue between them:

1. Is belief in God essential to Unitarianism?  
The Christian or Theistic party in the west answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, no!
2. Is worship essential to Unitarianism?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, no!
3. Is belief in immortality essential to Unitarianism?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, no!
4. Ought emphasis to be placed on the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ, and the historic and vital connection of our movement with the Christian Church?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, not necessarily!
5. Ought our *ministry* to be open to non-believers in God, immortality and worship, if such non-believers desire to enter or remain in it?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, no! The Ethical or Unity party answer, yes!
6. Ought our Unitarian *name* to be regarded as one which may properly be appropriated by Agnostics, Materialists, or Atheists?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, no! The Ethical or Unity party answer, yes!
7. Ought our Conferences, Associations and other general organizations which have administrative or missionary functions, and ask contributions from our churches to carry on the same, to stand on a distinctly Christian or Theistic basis of declared aim and purpose?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, no!
8. Ought money contributed to any of our denominational organizations for Unitarian missionary purposes, to be used to "give assistance to any church or organization which does not rest distinctly upon the Christian basis?"  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, no! The Ethical or Unity party answer, yes!
9. To sum up in a word: Is Unitarianism essentially or necessarily Christian or Theistic?  
The Christian or Theistic party answer, yes! The Ethical or Unity party answer, no!
- [10.] On the question of the *essentialness* of *ethics*, both are agreed.
- [11.] On the essentialness of "Freedom, Fellowship and Character", both are agreed.
- [12.] On the essentialness of "Truth, Righteousness and Love", both are agreed.
- [13.] Both parties unite in saying, Men must believe in *all* these in order to be true Unitarians; there is no true Unitarianism which leaves these out. So far we go together. Then we separate; and in this wise.  
The Christian or Theistic party say:  
To these Ethical and Free Thought essentials must be added certain Christian and Theistic essentials, viz.: At least belief in God, worship, the immortal life and the moral and spiritual leadership of Jesus. These are precisely as necessary and fundamental in Unitarianism as are Ethics and Free Thought. Unitarianism is an arch, one foot of which rests upon Ethics and the other upon Christian Theism. It is equally impossible to take away either foundation without destroying the arch.  
The Ethical or Unity party say, No! Unitarianism is a structure no part of which rests fundamentally on any Christian or Theistic belief whatever, not even belief in God. Ethics and free thought exhaust its essentials. The Christian and Theistic beliefs named used to be regarded generally as necessary; but that they are so *we deny*. We contend for a new interpretation of Unitarianism which shall place these among non-essentials. Individually most of us believe and believe earnestly in these, and sincerely wish others generally to do the same. But this is purely an individual matter. These Christian and Theistic beliefs are no necessary part of Unitarianism, and need not be declared to be. Nothing is essential to Unitarianism but Ethics and Free Thought.

The above comparisons and contrasts show in brief exactly what is the issue in the west. It is for Unitarians west and east to judge for themselves whether the matter is a trivial one or not. It is for Unitarians west and east to judge for themselves which side is right, and to take their stand accordingly.

A. A. LIVERMORE,  
A. P. PEABODY,  
RUSH R. SHIPPEN,  
GEORGE W. CUTTER,

JAMES T. BIXBY,  
JOHN SNYDER,  
J. T. SUNDERLAND,  
HENRY H. BARBER.



## UNITY

AND THE UNIVERSITY.

Editors, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, David Utter, James Vila Blake, William C. Gannett, John C. Learned, Henry M. Simmons, Frederick L. Hosmer; Special Editorial Contributors, John R. Effinger, Charles Douglas, Judson Fisher, Edwin R. Champlin, Horace L. Traubel, Celia P. Woolley, Emma Endicott Marean, Ellen T. Leonard, and others; Office Editor, Charles H. Kerr. The editors assume no responsibility for the opinions expressed by correspondents. Communications must be marked with the real name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

\*The subscription price of UNITY is \$1.50 per annum, payable in advance. Single copies 5 cents. The date on the address label indicates the time to which the subscription is paid. Remittances are acknowledged by changing this date. No written receipts are sent unless requested. Subscribers are requested to note the expiration of their subscriptions and send in their renewals without waiting for bills. No paper discontinued without an explicit order and payment of all arrearages. Remit by draft on Chicago or New York, or by postal or express order, payable to CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 175 Dearborn street, Chicago.

\*With an increasing circulation among the most desirable class of readers, UNITY AND THE UNIVERSITY offers an excellent medium for remunerative advertising. Only a limited space is allowed for advertisements, and no objectionable advertisements are taken at any price. Cuts and heavy display will be admitted only on the second and the two last pages, not on the front page or in the body of the paper. Rate per line, agate measure, 6 cents, reading notices 12 cents per agate line for space occupied. Advertisements may be sent to this office direct, or through any responsible advertising agency.

## Notes from the Field.

**Midland, Mich.**—The 15th of August is somewhat a marked day in the little Unitarian fellowship in the west, as one in which two new churches were dedicated, both of them "cottage chapels", i. e., attempts to meet the home needs of small parishes. The same ideal called forth the plans for the Helena chapel and the one for this place. Indeed, the design was originally procured by the American Unitarian Association from Peabody & Stearns, of Boston, with the Helena needs immediately in mind, with the hope that it might answer the needs of many others; but the plans offered by J. L. Silsbee, of this city, being still more simple and economic, were adopted by this society, the result of which is given elsewhere.

—A local paper thus describes at length the Midland church: "It is built in Queen Anne style, with low body, steep red roof, dormer windows and romantic shingle-covered gables. The main structure is 58x24 feet, the high basement walls being of a bluish stone, the body a light color, and the roof mainly red. The main entrance is on the Ashman street side, through a small vestibule. The room is ceiled up with pine all around and overhead, being but thirteen feet high. The wood is neatly finished and varnished. The room, which is practically one, is in two divisions, which will be separated only by curtains suspended on poles. The main audience portion is about 23x39 feet and is seated with 105 opera chairs. The other division, Sunday-school room, etc., is seated with 100 portable folding chairs. There is a cosy fire grate at the side opposite the entrance, but the building will be principally heated by a furnace in the basement. The windows are of cathedral glass of various colors. A handsome carpet covers the floor. The basement will be plastered, hardfinished, and floored with cement. The greater portion will be occupied with dining-room, kitchen and wood room. It is perhaps the dryest, best lighted basement in town, the windows being large and the basement extending only about three feet below the surface."

—We have not yet received accounts of the dedication services, which were to be conducted by Revs. J. T. Sunderland, Albert Walkley and the resident pastor, L. R. Daniels. UNITY extends its congratulation to pastor and people and commends their example to the friends of fifty other localities in the west who can afford and use a four thousand dollar religious home, while an attempt to realize a \$10,000 church would only bring vexation, disappointment and defeat.

**The Withdrawing Societies—Which Are They?**—So much has been said of late of certain churches having "withdrawn from the Western Conference", that we think it but just to say that, so far as we know, no official action has been taken by any society looking in such a direction, at least no such information has been conveyed to the officers of the Conference. The most that has been done has been the notification on the part of one or two pastors and perhaps two or three committees that the full amount of the usual contributions may not be forthcoming this year. The attitude of the churches themselves toward the Conference cannot be determined until it is seen how many societies will give less than \$10 to its treasury this year and fail to send delegations to the annual meeting in 1887. The following note will indicate how easy it is to make too much controversial use of small facts, when the theologians fall into the old time business of drawing lines where God hath made none. This is the way Keokuk "falls into line".

"DEAR UNITY:—We were glad to see you true to yourself in correcting an error in regard to our pioneer church in Keokuk. Having made myself acquainted with the facts, I think it my duty to undeceive you, and I know you will do full justice to our liberal friends. I wish to make this remark: The Keokuk society desires to have 'the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace'. They are striving nobly to pay their debt, and if any person desires to make a contribution they will gladly accept a golden eagle, but will not thank any person for a *theological wedge*. It is the desire of all the ministers of Iowa in charge of parishes to work in this unity for Truth, Righteousness and Love. I am authorized to say by those representing the dominating thought of the parish, that when some resolutions were sent by an influential friend of the parish, asking the congregation to pass them, in which they would have said that they repudiated the Western Conference, the congregation 'declined to pass the resolutions or to take part in the controversy now in progress'. They did, however, pass resolutions reiterating the declaration made by the church in 1869. The dominant opinion of the church is that 'the controversy is unnecessary, that the Western Unitarian Conference is an important factor for good, and there is no need of division on the question involved, viz., that as to whether any declaration of belief was necessary on the part of any person desiring fellowship with us.' The Keokuk church refused to repudiate the Western Conference, even when the resolution was sent by an influential friend of the church. It is simply just to say this.

August 8, 1886.

S. S. HUNTING."

**Dakota City, Neb.**—Rev. Mary A. Safford recently preached here, and the local paper, the North Nebraska Argus, says: "She gave a sermon of extraordinary excellence. It was full of gems, and might properly be called a prose poem. She captivated her audience, and they all felt that she had been called of God to enter the holy ministry and raise humanity to a higher plane. She won all hearts, for those present saw that her pulpit ministrations were the outgrowth of a spirit of devotion which had no stain of selfishness in it. She stood before them as a messenger sent from heaven to guide their feet and to quicken their spiritual sensibilities. All felt that if they could be favored with such heavenly sermons as she gives from week to week, their progress in the divine field would indeed be rapid. To say that she is doing a great and glorious work in building up a Unitarian church in Sioux City, is superfluous, for all in our county know it. The people of Dakota City, as a whole, reflected great credit on themselves by the hearty reception given to this lady minister. Were she to favor us with another visit no building here would be large enough to hold

the great crowd that would assemble, for our people have such a high degree of intelligence that they know how to appreciate a minister whose gifts and graces are of the very highest order."

**Kenwood.**—Last Sunday morning "we"—or one of us—attended services at the "Union Chapel" in Kenwood, just south of the corporate limits of Chicago. A home-like little cottage-chapel it is, with no pews, but chairs grouped conveniently around the desk and organ. The pastor was absent, and the minister of the day, whose name we cannot now recall, was a gray-haired man retired some years, we were told, from a Presbyterian pastorate. Behind the speaker hung a printed creed, in which certain black letters set forth a belief in the resurrection of the body; but the minister was looking the other way, and he had not proceeded far with his sermon before he said that we know well enough what becomes of the body after death,—that it becomes part of the cosmic matter, one with the waving grass and the eddying dust. His general theme was soul-building, and he said that the stains left by sin could be removed only by degrees, unaccountably forgetting the magic process taught by his theological school. But perhaps he may be excused, for he must have been out of school for forty years,—and all these years he has been living and watching other men live.

**Newton, Iowa.**—S. S. Hunting has been preaching at this place with fair prospects of a permanent organization under the title of the Unity Society of Newton. The printed circular bears as its motto the words "Truth, Righteousness and Love." It provides for officers and three working committees: one for study, the second for reform work and the third for fellowship and hospitality, and it offers the following BOND OF UNITY: "Trusting in God and gratefully accepting the Christian heritage through the progressive development of historic Christianity, wishing to emphasize the moral activities of life and strengthen its religious sanctions, we unite in this Unity, in the interests of Truth, Righteousness and Love. Our aim is to emphasize Truth, not belief; Righteousness, not ritual; Character, not creed; Right, not expediency; and Principle, not policy. This Unity conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all who desire to work for the objects herein set forth."

**The Milwaukee Literary School** is now in session. A ten days' programme is arranged upon Goethe,—such names as Professors Harris, McAllister, F. B. Sanborn, Denton Snider, Mrs. D. L. Shorey and Mrs. Caroline K. Sherman, of Chicago, appearing.

**Normal Park, Ill.**—J. R. Effinger, the western secretary, has this week removed his family to Normal Park, one of the attractive suburbs of Chicago. In a few days he may be found at 175 Dearborn street during office hours, when not absent from the city.

**Bloomington, Ill.**—Rev. H. A. Westall, of Woburn, Mass., is in Bloomington. He preached in the Unitarian church on Sunday the 22d, and remains until after the 29th.

**Tremont, Ill.**—The pulpit at this place was filled on the 15th inst. by J. B. Frost, late of Meadville.

**Sheffield, Ill.**—On Sunday the 22d Mr. J. B. Frost preached in Sheffield.

## Protectionists

Who wish to diffuse a general understanding of their principles can find no better compendium than the *American Protectionist's Manual*, by Giles B. Stebbins. The Chicago Inter Ocean says: "It collects the largest and most valuable and the freshest and most readable fund of information ever brought together in so short a compass upon economic subjects. It is more instructive than any book of like dimensions ever issued in England, France or America." 192 pages, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 40 cents, postpaid. CHARLES H. KERR & CO., Publishers, 175 Dearborn St., Chicago.